

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 20-27 are now pending in the application. Claims 21-27 are new, and the remaining claims stand rejected for the reasons given in the office action. In particular, claims 1-4, 6-10, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rationale for this rejection is given on pages 2-5 of the office action. In addition, claims 1-10 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Leal (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,003). Further, claims 1 and 20 stand objected to for the reason given on page 2, i.e., the inappropriate use of the initials “SIC”.

We have hereby amended the claims to overcome the objection to claims 1 and 20, and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In addition, new claims have been added to more fully protect one aspect of applicants’ invention, namely, the aspect relating to how advertisements are handled. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, we respectfully urge the Examiner to reconsider the application and to withdraw all of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 102, and to withdraw the objection to claims 1 and 20.

### Interview Requested

We respectfully request the Examiner to call applicants’ undersigned attorney at 206.332.1384 to arrange a telephonic interview in the event that the Examiner does not feel that the application is in condition for allowance following entry of the present amendment.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

With respect to the rejection of claims 6-10 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, i.e., a computer program *per se*, we have amended claim 6 to clarify that the claimed subject matter is not directed to a disembodied computer program *per se*. Specifically, claim 6 recites that the “instructions” are stored on a “**computer readable medium**” and that the claimed system includes a “**data store**.” Accordingly, we respectfully submit that the claims are clearly directed to statutory subject matter, and that this rejection should be withdrawn. However, should the Examiner disagree, applicants’ undersigned attorney would be happy to

discuss the matter with the Examiner in an effort to reach an agreement as to appropriate claim language.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-4 and 20, we have amended independent claim 1 to clarify that the claimed method is directed to a “**computer-implemented**” method for registering business directory listings and advertisements. The claimed method employs a computer-based directory of business listings and advertising, and accepts requests from a “client”, “via a network.” Thus, the claimed method is carried out using a computer network, e.g., a client-server network of a kind described in applicants’ specification. We respectfully submit that claim 1 passes muster under § 101.

With respect to claim 20, we respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection. This claim is directed to a “system for the registration of business listings and advertisements,” and recites three elements in means-plus-function format, which is authorized by 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph. As such, we respectfully submit that the claims are directed to the “technological arts” and thus pass muster under § 101. Again, should the Examiner feel there is still a problem with claim 20, applicants’ undersigned attorney would like to discuss the matter further in an effort to reach agreement as to allowable claim language.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-10 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Leal. The Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw this rejection. Several aspects of applicants’ claimed invention are neither disclosed nor suggested by Leal. For instance, with respect to applicants’ claim 1, applicants’ claimed invention provides a computer-implemented method to register business directory listings **and advertisements**. A data structure is stored in a data store, and the data structure accepts both business listings **and advertisements**, and is **organized as a tree with leaf level nodes**. These aspects of the claimed invention are neither disclosed nor suggested by Leal. Claim 5 is similar to claim 1 in the respects noted above, and so claim 5 similarly is distinguished over Leal.

**DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0166/144193.1**

**Application No.: 09/650,605**

**Office Action Dated:** July 6, 2004

**PATENT**

Claim 6 recites a registration engine and a business directory listing data store, which includes advertisements along with business directory listing data. The storage of advertisements along with the business directory listing data is neither disclosed nor suggested by Leal. Claim 20 is similarly distinguished over Leal. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

**CONCLUSION**

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited for claims 1-10 and 20-27.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael D. Stein  
Registration No. 34,734

Date: August 26, 2004

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439